

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UKRAINIAN FUTURE CREDIT UNION,
a state chartered credit union,

Plaintiff,

Case No: 2:17-cv-11483-MEL-SDD
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

vs.

WILLIAM R. SEIKALY,
an individual,
JOHN/JANE DOE,
an individual,
SEIKALY, STEWART & BENNETT, P.C.,
a Michigan Professional Corporation,
Defendants;
All Defendants sued jointly & severally.

WILLIAM R. SEIKALY and SEIKALY, STEWART & BENNETT, P.C.'s
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE RESPONSIVE
PLEADINGS

Defendants, William R. Seikaly and Seikaly, Stewart & Bennett, P.C. (“Seikaly Parties”), hereby move for a twenty one (21) day extension of time to respond to Plaintiffs Ukrainian Future Credit Union’s Complaint and state as follows:

1. On May 9, 2017, Plaintiff filed its Complaint in this Court.

2. On June 7, 2017, Plaintiffs executed service of process on the Seikaly Parties.

3. The Seikaly Parties responsive pleadings to Plaintiffs' Complaint are due on June 28, 2017.

4. The Seikaly Parties require a 21 day extension of time to file responsive pleadings because they just retained counsel and are still in the process of gathering and reviewing the materials necessary to respond to the 88 paragraph Complaint. A 21 day extension of time would extend the due date for the Seikaly Parties responsive pleadings up to and including **July 19, 2017**.

5. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(b), this Court may extend the time for when an act may or must be done.

6. In accordance with Local Rule 7.1, counsel for the Seikaly Parties telephoned Mr. James Bigelow, counsel for Plaintiff, to seek concurrence of the relief requested in this motion on June 21, 2017 and again on June 22, 2017. Counsel for the Seikaly Parties received a voicemail recording for Mr. Bigelow and left voice messages requesting an extension in both messages. Counsel for the Seikaly Parties also sent emails on June 21, 2017 and June 22, 2017 in an effort to seek concurrence for the extension. However, as of the filing of this Motion, counsel for the Seikaly Parties has been unable to reach Plaintiffs' counsel. All voice messages and emails have been unreturned.

WHEREFORE, the Seikaly Parties respectfully requests that this Court grant their Motion to Extend Time and enter the proposed order, separately submitted.

COLLINS EINHORN FARRELL PC

BY: /s/ Kellie Howard-Goudy
Kellie Howard Goudy (P69009)
Attorney for Defendants William Seikaly and
Seikaly, Stewart & Bennett, P.C.
4000 Town Center, 9th Floor
Southfield, MI 48075
(248) 355-4141
kellie.howard-goudy@ceflawyers.com

Dated: June 22, 2017

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UKRAINIAN FUTURE CREDIT UNION,
a state chartered credit union,

Plaintiff,

Case No: 2:17-cv-11483-MEL-SDD
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

vs.

WILLIAM R. SEIKALY,
an individual,
JOHN/JANE DOE,
an individual,
SEIKALY, STEWART & BENNETT, P.C.,
a Michigan Professional Corporation,
Defendants;
All Defendants sued jointly & severally.

WILLIAM R. SEIKALY and SEIKALY, STEWART & BENNETT, P.C.'s
BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
TO FILE RESPONSIVE PLEADINGS

CONCISE STATEMENT OF ISSUE PRESENTED

Whether the Seikaly Parties should be granted an extension of time until July 19, 2017 to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint?

CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY

Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(b)

Defendants William R. Seikaly and Seikaly, Stewart & Bennett, P.C. (“Seikaly Parties”), in support of their Motion for Extension of Time to File Responsive Pleadings, state as follows:

On May 9, 2017, Plaintiff filed its 88 paragraph Complaint in this Court. On June 7, 2017, Plaintiffs executed service of process on the Seikaly Parties. Responsive pleadings to Plaintiffs’ Complaint are due on June 28, 2017.

Undersigned counsel was retained by the Seikaly Parties on June 19, 2017. The Seikaly Parties and their counsel are in the process of gathering and reviewing the materials necessary to respond to the 88 paragraph Complaint.

Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(b) provides in part that a court may, for good cause, extend the time for when an act must be done with or without motion before the original time or its extension expires. The Seikaly Parties bring this motion before its response to the Complaint is due. Further, good cause exists to grant this brief extension because the Seikaly Parties have just retained counsel and counsel is currently working diligently with the Seikaly Parties to obtain and review the necessary materials and documents to answer the Complaint.

The Court may note that this case is based on a case that was originally filed in Macomb County Circuit Court. The Docket Sheet for the Macomb County case was 45 pages long. The length of the docket sheet from the underlying case is indicative of the breadth and complexity of the issues and documents involved in

this case. Despite their best efforts, the Seikaly Parties need additional time to respond to the Complaint.

WHEREFORE, the Seikaly Parties respectfully requests that this Court grant it a 21day extension, until July 19, 2017, to file responsive pleadings and enter the proposed order, separately submitted.

COLLINS EINHORN FARRELL PC

BY: /s/ Kellie Howard-Goudy
Kellie Howard Goudy (P69009)
Attorney for Defendants William Seikaly and
Seikaly, Stewart & Bennett, P.C.
4000 Town Center, 9th Floor
Southfield, MI 48075
(248) 355-4141
kellie.howard-goudy@ceflawyers.com

Dated: June 22, 2017

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 22, 2017, a copy of the foregoing instrument was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all parties to the above cause to each of the attorneys of record herein.

COLLINS EINHORN FARRELL PC

BY: /s/ Kellie Howard-Goudy
Kellie Howard Goudy (P69009)
Attorney for Defendants William Seikaly and
Seikaly, Stewart & Bennett, P.C.
4000 Town Center, 9th Floor
Southfield, MI 48075
(248) 355-4141
kellie.howard-goudy@ceflawyers.com

Dated: June 22, 2017